



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,821	08/15/2001	Atsuo F. Fukunaga		2396

7590 11/14/2002

Daniel B. Schein, Ph.D., Esq.
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P. O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER

WEISS JR, JOSEPH FRANCIS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3761

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/930,821

Applicant(s)
Fukunaga et al.

Examiner
Joseph Weiss

Art Unit
3761



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph Weiss

(3) Dr. Blanca Fukunaga

(2) Danial Schein

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 12, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 13

Identification of prior art discussed:

US 5284160

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed the prior art swivel connection points 35 (A & B) in regards to their ability as disclosed and understood by one of ordinary skill in the art as facilitating the function of attachment/detachment. Arguments supported by proof of such not being attachable/detachable would be the optimal form of persuasion. Arguments regarding attachment/detachment of the proximal terminal as rendering the device inoperative, does not appear persuasive at this time because such are not parts of the claimed invention. Such are arguments of intended use, results or operative environment, which alone would not establish patentability unless they implicate patently distinct structure. Please note a proximal terminal or a unilimb breathing circuit is not being claimed, but cited in the claim language as what the environment, intended use or results are related to the claimed invention, which is a proximal fitting.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required